

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of: Shell S. Simpson) Confirmation No: 7709
Serial No.: 09/981,392)
Filed: October 17, 2001) Group Art Unit: 2155
For: System for Controlled Printing of a) Examiner: Baturay, Alicia
Signature Using Web-Based Imaging) Docket No.: 10007682-1
)

REPLY BRIEF RESPONSIVE TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

The Examiner's Answer mailed January 10, 2008 has been carefully considered.

In response thereto, please consider the following remarks.

AUTHORIZATION TO DEBIT ACCOUNT

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those which may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.

REMARKS

The Examiner has provided in the Examiner's Answer various responses to arguments contained in Applicant's Appeal Brief. Although the Examiner's Answer has added some additional remarks in response to Applicant's arguments, the substance of the rejections and the Examiner's positions have not changed. Accordingly, Applicant stands behind the arguments set forth in the Appeal Brief. In addition, Applicant addresses selected responses in the following.

For example, claim 1 recites "wherein said particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing said predetermined graphic symbol on said represented image." In the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner asserts that these claimed features do not have to be disclosed by the cited art, since the wherein clause follows a conditional limitation at the end of the claim. In response, Applicant submits that the wherein clause is not a conditional limitation and references a particular symbol set that is recited throughout the body of the claim. Therefore, the wherein clause does have to be disclosed by the cited art.

On this point, the Examiner further contends that Savoray discloses "wherein said particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing said predetermined graphic symbol on said represented image." With regard to Savoray, it appears to teach at most a method for producing an electronic signature in a scaleable font format from a raster or bitmap image of a manual, handwritten signature. See col. 3, lines 25-27. The produced electronic signature may then be attached to an electronic document. See col. 5, lines 10-23. In Savoray, mapping characteristics are not

identified for producing a predetermined graphic symbol. Rather, an image is analyzed and converted to a font format.

Whereas, the claimed subject matter discloses a method in which a printable version of an image is generated at a source service, where the image includes a predetermined graphic symbol. The graphic symbol references a particular symbol set. If the service or client producing the image does not have the particular symbol set, then the graphic symbol is not printed or displayed on the image. In some embodiments, the particular symbol set is an actual signature. Therefore, only services or clients having the particular symbol set are able to display or print the actual signature, in some embodiments. Accordingly, the cited art fails to teach or suggest at least "wherein said particular symbol set identifies mapping characteristics for producing said predetermined graphic symbol on said represented image," as recited in claim 1.

Using similar reasoning, the cited art does not teach or suggest the subject matter of remaining claims 2-46. For the reasons presented herein and the reasons earlier presented in the Appeal Brief, the cited references are deficient in disclosing claimed features, and the arguments set forth in the Appeal Brief still stand. The rejection of the pending claims should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In summary, it is Applicant's position that Applicant's claims are patentable over the applied cited art references and that the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn. Appellant therefore respectfully requests that the Board of Appeals overturn the Examiner's rejection and allow Applicant's pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Charles W. Griggers
Registration No. 47,283